

**REMARKS**

The courtesy of the Examiner at the interview with Applicants undersigned attorney on November 29, 2007. The substance of the interview is set forth hereafter.

At the interview, the rejections under 35 USC § 112, the cited Mimura et al. USP 6,080,364 and the amendments to the claims contained in the Amendment filed November 26, 2007 were discussed. Further amendments to the claims were also discussed relating to emphasizing more of the apparatus since the claims are apparatus claims and not method claims. No agreement was reached regarding the allowance of any claims.

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to further clarify Applicant's invention and to emphasize more of the apparatus. Thus, claim 1 now recites reaction vessels in the analysis units for reacting samples and reagents and calls for the display section to be configured to display on a screen images of a flow of plural setup operation steps used for starting up the automatic analyzer and as well to display images of the analysis unit on the same screen of the automatic analyzer.

Claim 1 has been further amended to define the control sections being configured to control a display section to display the images of setup operation step or steps requiring a setup operation by an operator with a displaying manner different from a displaying manner of an image of another setup operation step or steps not requiring the setup operation by an operator and to be configured to control the display section to display an image of an analysis unit requiring setup operation by an operator with a displaying manner different from an image of a displaying manner

of an analysis unit not requiring setup operation by an operator.

Dependent claims 2-8 have also been amended to conform to the amendments to claim 1.

It is important to recognize that there are plural preparation operations required at the time of start-up of an automatic analyzer. Some of the preparation operations are required to be operated by an operator and other preparation operations are not required to be operated by an operator.

A preparation operation requiring an operator's operation is changed at each start-up operation of an automatic analyzer. Therefore, according to the present invention a preparation operation requiring an operator's operation is displayed on a display screen by a display manner different from a display manner of other preparation operations not requiring an operator's operation.

According to the cited Mimura '364 patent, however, a warning is displayed on a display screen when a calibration operation is required during an operation of an automatic analyzer after the automatic analyzer has been started. This is quite different from Applicant's invention which relates to a start-up operation of an automatic analyzer.

Mimura does not even suggest or discuss any problems in the start-up operation of an automatic analyzer. Therefore, according to Mimura, the preparation requiring an operator's operation at the start-up operation must be judged by an experienced operator. Applicant's invention thus has a significant advantage over that of Mimura '364.

It is therefore submitted that Applicants claims 1-8 are now allowable.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. KAS-185).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By Gene W. Stockman  
Gene W. Stockman  
Reg. No. 21,021

GWS/na  
(703)684-1120  
Date: December 12, 2007